



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,233	12/01/2003	Irene Quenville	P03346	2124

7590 03/10/2005

RITA D. VACCA  
BAUSCH & LOMB INCORPORATED  
ONE BAUSCH & LOMB PLACE  
ROCHESTER, NY 14604-2701

EXAMINER	
DELCOTTO, GREGORY R	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1751	

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/725,233

Applicant(s)

QUENVILLE ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory R. Del Cotto

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12-03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-17 are pending.

***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-7, drawn to compositions for contact lens care, classified in class 510, subclass 112.
- II. Claims 8-17, drawn to a method of enhancing biocidal efficacy of a lens care solution, classified in class 514, subclass 840.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of Group I and Group II are related as product and process of use.

The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the composition of Group I can be used in a materially different process such as in a method of cleaning dishes.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1751

During a telephone conversation with Denis Polyn on March 4, 2005, a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-7. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 8-17 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1-7 are objected to because of the following informalities:

With respect to instant claim 1, it appears that this claim should read as an article of manufacture and not a composition due to the presence of the container as a claim limitation. Claims 2-7 have also been objected to due to their dependency on claim 1.

Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1751

Claim 2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to instant claim 2, this claim recites a Markush group of tradenames. Note that, if the trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 USC 112, second paragraph. See MPEP 2173.05(u).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

Art Unit: 1751

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1751

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asgharian et al (US 6,228,323).

Asgharian et al teach a two-compartment bottle assembly useful in preparing multi-purpose compositions containing an Al-trypsin and disinfectant. These compositions are useful for cleaning and disinfecting contact lenses. See Abstract. The bottle may be made out of materials such as molded polyethylene, polyethyleneterephthalate (PET), etc. See column 5, lines 1-5. The disinfecting compositions generally contain one or more antimicrobial agents, a buffer, tonicity agents, a chelating agent, and surfactants (i.e. block copolymers). See column 11, lines 50-69. Specifically, Asgharian et al contain cleaning compositions containing 0.001% Polyquaternium 1, 0.6% boric acid, 0.1% sodium chloride, 0.05% Tetronic 1304, 0.05 disodium edetate, water, etc. See column 14, lines 25-45.

Asgharian et al do not teach, with sufficient specificity, an article of manufacture comprising a container formed from polyethyleneterephthalate and a composition containing surfactants, antimicrobial agents, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate an article of manufacture comprising a container formed from polyethyleneterephthalate and a composition containing surfactants, antimicrobial agents, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the

Art Unit: 1751

broad teachings of Asgharian et al suggest an article of manufacture comprising a container formed from polyethyleneterephthalate and a composition containing surfactants, antimicrobial agents, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 1 and 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Groemminger (US 2002/0115578).

'578 teaches an aqueous composition for cleaning and wetting a contact lens containing a non-amine polyethyleneoxy-containing material having an HLB value of at least about 18, a first non-ionic surface active agent having cleaning activity for contact lens deposits that comprises a polxamine, a second non-ionic surface active agent, and wetting agent. See Abstract. The cleaning compositions also include buffering agents such as sodium carbonate. Also, the compositions may contain antimicrobial agents in amounts from 0.00001 to about 5% by weight. See para. 23-26. The compositions may also contain a sequestering agent such as EDTA.

Groemminger does not teach the use of a polyethyleneterephthalate containing or an article of manufacture comprising a container formed from polyethyleneterephthalate and a composition containing surfactants, antimicrobial agents, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Asgharian et al are relied upon as set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to package the compositions taught by Groemminger in a



Art Unit: 1751

polyethyleneterephthalate container, at the time the invention was made, because Asgharian et al teaches the use of a polyethyleneterephthalate container to package similar contact lens cleaning/disinfecting compositions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, for formulate an article of manufacture comprising a container formed from polyethyleneterephthalate and a composition containing surfactants, antimicrobial agents, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of Groemminger in combination with Asgharian et al suggest an article of manufacture comprising a container formed from polyethyleneterephthalate and a composition containing surfactants, antimicrobial agents, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asgharian et al (US 6,228,323) or Groemminger (US 2002/0115578) in view of Asgharian et al (US 6,228,323) as applied to the rejected claims above, and further in view of Winterton et al (US 5,209,865).

Asgharian et al and Groemminger are relied upon as set forth above. However, neither reference teaches the specific surfactant in addition to the other requisite components of the composition as recited by the instant claims.

Art Unit: 1751

Winterton et al teach a conditioning solution for contact lenses which comprises a polyoxyethylene-polyoxypropylene substituted ethylenediamine nonionic surfactant.

See column 2, lines 1-11. Suitable surfactants include those under the trade name Tetronic and include Tetronic 1101, 1102, 1301, 1302, etc. See column 3, lines 27-47.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a surfactant such as Tetronic 1301 or 1101 in the cleaning compositions taught by Asgharian et al or Groemminger, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Winterton et al teach the use of Tetronic 1101 or 1301 in a similar contact lens cleaning composition and further, Asgharian et al or Groemminger teach the use of tetronic surfactants in general.

### ***Conclusion***

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Remaining references cited but not relied upon are considered to be cumulative to or less pertinent than those relied upon or discussed above.


Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

Art Unit: 1751

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Gregory R. Del Cotto  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1751

GRD  
March 6, 2005